

## Remarks

Claims 1-27 are now pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, and 12-14 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 3,259,816 to Katchman in view of U.S. patent 1,425,633 to Colby. The Examiner rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katchman and Colby and further in view of U.S. patent 3,480,759 to Sachs et al. The Examiner rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katchman and Colby and further in view of EP 1 112 803 to Tadauchi et al.

The combination of Katchman and Colby does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-6 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest an automated method for manufacturing a power capacitor that includes a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder. Rather, Katchman suggests a capacitor roll including a pair of convolutely wound electrode foils of metal insulated from each other by separate sheets of suitable dielectric material. At col. 2, lines 10-13, Katchman suggests that terminals 5 and 6 are electrically connected to opposite foil edges by a metal connection 7 produced by a Schooping, soldering or other suitable process. Hence, Katchman does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes pre-soldering with a

pre-solder and fixing a lead to the pre-solder with a second solder, especially since Katchman does not suggest the pre-solder to which to fix a lead.

Colby also does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder. Rather, Colby suggests an electrically heated solder pot comprising an adjustable means for holding a soldering iron to be used for manual soldering. As shown in Fig. 1, Colby only suggests manual soldering utilizing a soldering iron.

In view of the above, the combination of Katchman and Colby does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1-6. Therefore, the combination of Katchman and Colby does not make the invention recited in claims 1-6 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9-11 since, among other things, Sachs et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Katchman and Colby. For example, Sachs et al. also does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder. The Examiner cites Sachs et al. as suggesting a rotating solder tip. A rotating solder tip does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-

solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder.

Therefore, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9-11. Accordingly, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Sachs et al. does not make the invention recited in claims 9-11 obvious. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14 since, among other things, Tadauchi et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Katchman and Colby. For example, Tadauchi et al. also does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder. The Examiner cites Tadauchi et al. as suggesting solder having a melting point of 300-400°C. Solder having a melting point of 300-400°C does not suggest a two-step soldering process that includes coating an end surface of the capacitor with a preheated pre-solder and fixing at least one lead to the pre-solder by soldering the at least one lead to the pre-solder with a second solder.

Accordingly, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14. As a result, the combination of Katchman, Colby and Tadauchi et al. does not make the invention recited in claims 9-11 obvious. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 15, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicant  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300